



Grantmakers in the Arts
2003 Conference

THE EDGE

Proceedings from the Conference

October 19-22, 2003
W Hotel
Seattle, Washington

MEMBER REPORT

STRATEGIES OF PUBLIC AGENCIES TO POSITION THE ARTS IN A NEW ENVIRONMENT

In the current economic and social environment, funders from both public and private sectors are challenged to compellingly articulate the case for arts support and funding. The challenges in these discussions are reflected in the healthy and sometimes difficult tension that funding organizations face in juggling 1) the mission 2) the capacity to fulfill the mission and 3) the authorizing environment that controls and distributes the resources for the arts.

This session will explore the opportunities that arise from today's current complex environment to more adequately state the case for arts support. The research and learning from the Wallace Foundation's project with 13 state arts agencies will provide the foundation for the discussion, including reflections from a Wallace sub-grantee and an elected official/arts supporter.

Session Designer: Shelley Cohn
Arizona Commission on the Arts

Moderator: Kristin Tucker
Washington State Arts Commission

Panelists: Michael Moore
Wallace Foundation

Jacqueline Moscou
Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center

Lynn Kessler
Majority Leader, Washington State Legislature

October 21, 2003, 10:00 a.m.

TUCKER: This panel was to be moderated by Shelley Cohn, executive director of the Arizona Commission on the Arts. Shelley has some family emergencies this week and so was unable to come to the conference and she sends her regrets and she emailed me her notes. So I'll try to cover for Shelly this morning.

But this session in case you're confused, is about strategies from public agencies to position the arts in a new environment. And we'll introduce the panelists in a minute, but I'd like to really go around the room first and really briefly have you introduce yourself.

This is my first GIA conference. My office is in Olympia, which is this morning almost two rainy hours drive south. Usually it's just one hour's drive south but... And we welcome you here. It is unusually wet here. The last I heard was we got 5.02 inches of rain yesterday, which is a record, so thank you for bringing that to our city. *[Laughter]*

So let's start here, and again if you'll just briefly state who you are and where you're from, or if you want to say very briefly something that you might be interested in or we could discuss in this session. Marie?

CONNOLLY: I'm Marie Connolly from the Wallace Foundation. We are working very closely with state arts agencies.

TUCKER: I'm going to pass this, I'll try to remember this. But this is for recording purposes, not amplification, so... So that was Marie.

BOZZUTO: Hi! Lexie Bozzuto, also from the Wallace Foundation. And I'm new to the Wallace Foundation and want to learn more about the work we do with state arts agencies.

MORRIS: Carolyn Morris, executive director of Alternate ROOTS and a former program director with the State of Mississippi and just wanted to stay informed about what's going on at the state level.

CABRERA: Rem Cabrera with the Miami Dade County Department of Cultural Affairs. I've been with the department for thirteen years and this is my first visit to Seattle and Grantmakers in the Arts.

CRUZ: Hi, I'm Pat Cruz. I'm here with two hats on. I'm at Aaron Davis Hall as the executive director and I'm also on the board of the Warhol Foundation.

And one of the reasons I'm here is that I really do believe that there is a kind of crisis we're

facing in terms of how the arts are positioned within society, within our communities, and I'm hoping to get some enlightenment in terms of the changes in direction and strategies that are going to be employed to change that.

HECTOR: I'm Darcy Hector with the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation in New York, and I'm very interested in hearing this session. We've had a longstanding interest in advocacy and this really sounds like advocacy to me.

SOLOTAROFF: Sarah Solotaroff, Chicago Community Trust, just sitting in. I'm curious.

MARTY: Marty ... Foundation. And I'm apologizing, I have to leave early, but it's not because I'm bored.

SALLEE: I'm Jaclyn Sallee and I'm a board member of the CIRI Foundation, and I'm also the director of the Koahnic Broadcast Corporation which is based in Anchorage, Alaska. And this is my first GIA conference. It's been great.

HALPERN: Hi. I'm Rhyena Halpern with the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission and we just keep getting cut a lot lately, and we're facing more cuts when California's vehicle license tax gets revoked. So I am just really interested in this whole issue of funding public art agencies.

PRATT: I'm Sabrina Pratt with the City of Santa Fe Arts Commission. And we're not being cut, thank goodness, but I'm interested in strengthening our position ...

ABRAMS: Hi. I'm Fran Abrams with the Arts and Humanities Council of Montgomery County, Maryland. And we've been fortunate in the past three years not to suffer any cuts. But our arts community is expanding rapidly and our budget has not expanded to keep pace with theirs. And this year we have been told we will have to cut. So I see it as an issue of advocacy as well.

KATAHIRA: Hi. I'm Anne Katahira, I'm a program officer at the Seattle Foundation, and I was particularly interested in the description about how to articulate the need for public support for the arts.

TSUTAKAWA: Hi. I'm Mayumi Tsutakawa. I'm with the Washington State Arts Commission, and working specifically on our Wallace project to reach the underserved communities around the state.

LAMBERT: Hi. I'm Ava Lambert with the San Antonio Office of Cultural Affairs. I'm here to learn more about the issues, and this is my first GIA conference.



POWELL: Hi. Good morning. I'm Patrice Walker Powell, the director of local arts agencies for the National Endowment for the Arts. After going through a devolution in the mid '90s, we are rebuilding by actually providing what I'll call discrete opportunities for local arts agencies to apply in several categories, in spite of our one application rule that's currently in place.

SHERMER: Jim Shermer, I'm the grants administrator for Broward County Cultural Division.

BARSDATE: Kelly Barsdate, director of research and policy for the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. I work with the nation's fifty-six state and jurisdictional arts councils, all of whom are interested in case-making and strategic grantmaking. And I'm here to listen and share.

CRAVENS: Hi. I'm Curtis Cravens, I'm with the HKH Foundation, a small family foundation with focus of civic participation.

FLAVELL: Hi. I'm Jim Flavell with Marin Community Foundation. We have a very longstanding strong partnership with the County Arts Council, which helps to supplement the lack of resources in Sacramento.

BYE: I'm Carolyn Bye with the Metropolitan Regional Arts Council in Minnesota. We serve the seven counties surrounding Minneapolis and St Paul.

NEWIRTH: I'm Rich Newirth with the San Francisco Arts Commission.

CHONG: I'm Henry Chong with the Ontario Trillium Foundation, a granting agency of the provincial government of Ontario, Canada.

TUCKER: Okay, thanks. You can just pass that out. Again, the mics are for recording purposes, as you noted, they don't really amplify anything, but for some reason they want to know every word we say. So it's going to be recorded and I'm sure for a small price, you too can have a copy.

Strategies from Public Agencies to Position the Arts in the New Environment. For this panel, it was actually developed by Shelley and Michael and I at a conference a few months ago when we talked about a project that we're involved with funded by the Wallace Funds and supported by the fifty-six state arts agencies, thirteen of those state arts agencies specifically, so you'll hear more about that in a minute.

But I wanted to introduce our panelists. Lynn Kessler works with me. She is a commissioner

with the Washington State Arts Commission. She is also a member of the legislature. Our Arts Commission includes four legislators and we are lucky enough to have Lynn, who is the House Majority Leader, as a member of the Arts Commission. She is also a very strong arts advocate and was recently awarded a statewide arts advocacy award, and well deserved. She also in accepting that award mentioned that she and her husband bought a painting before a couch. So this is not an academic passion. *[Laughter]*

KESSLER: Not very practical. *[Laughter]*

TUCKER: Michael Moore is with the Wallace Foundation and manages the, as we call it the Start Project, this project with state arts agencies. It's a five-year project and Michael's going to provide us the context for that, and the Wallace perspective.

And Jacqueline Moscou is the artistic director at the Langston Hughes Performing Arts Center and also an actress and a theater director and wears many hats creatively and in arts management. So it's really a privilege to be part of this panel today.

Again, from the conference flyer we note that... in looking at this workshop we are all aware of this very significant time of change in the world of funding for the arts, from the public sector and the private sector.

This particular model that Wallace is leading us through provides us some different context for thinking about public funding for the arts and the public value for the arts.

So I think with that Michael, I'd like you to talk with us a little bit about the project and some of the things that we're discovering and exploring from your perspective.

I'll talk a little bit about our experience as one of the grantees for this project, then Lynn Kessler from a legislative perspective, and Jackie from the perspective of one of our grantees from Washington State.

So then of course we do want to have some Q&A; we'll try to fit all of that into the time allowed which is until 11:30. So be preparing your questions. Okay? Michael.

MOORE: Great. It's wonderful to be here this morning and with a great cross-section of public organizations and other supporters. So I want to talk a little bit about the work that we're doing, kind of what brought the Wallace Foundation to work with public agencies, and some specific



challenges that we're working through as well as some of the early results so far.

The Wallace Fund, in looking at state arts agencies, was attracted to a number of opportunities. They have much larger financial resources than we would ever have. They have a larger network of organizations they collectively serve, over 28,000 cultural groups in this country. They have a much more permanent presence than the Wallace Foundation is ever going to have in a community. And they're a small system of fifty-six agencies that really have national reach.

So for us it was a very attractive partnership to develop as we're working on the issues of how you build broader participation and engagement and support for the arts.

Any opportunity is not without its challenges, and some of the challenges that I think we're facing as we work with state agencies, is they're under tremendous pressure of kind of changing contexts and demands of their clients. A lot of the success that we've achieved in the last thirty years in this sector has really changed the world that we live in and the nature of organizations and what they need.

At the same time there's growing public pressure for accountability, unlike any time I think in previous history. They've developed over the past thirty years some very successful and established programs and strategies. But there's a line between what becomes entrenched and the incentives to keep those kind of existing practices in place and how that might prevent you from developing new practices.

And like any public agencies, public agencies are horribly underfunded in terms of their capacity for change and development. So we saw as a private foundation that there were maybe some opportunities that we could bring some resources to bear in a partnership and learn some things and help them maybe push forward on some of these challenges.

When we sat down to begin doing this work, state arts agency leaders told us three things that have turned out to be extremely important.

The first question that they had for us was, how can we change kind of staffing and programs of our agencies. We're public agencies and public agencies are kind of supposed to be stable and static and kind of in place, but we know that we need to change. How do you go about doing that?

Second question that they asked is how can we measure performance in ways that are meaningful and informative to our agency and how we create strategy in programs. We know we've done a lot of work; we collect a lot of data and information. How can we sort that out in a way that's meaningful to the work that we do?

And thirdly, how can we do a better job with communicating the value of the work that we're doing?

We took those questions very seriously, and the area that we began to focus on was how do you as a public agency create strategy? And in unpacking that issue, there were a number of things that began to kind of occur for us.

One is the strategy models that are largely used in this field have been borrowed and adapted from the private sector, and they're difficult to adapt to the nonprofit sector. They're almost impossible to adapt to public agencies for some reasons that we'll talk about in just a moment.

So it wasn't clear to us that there was a model for how you create strategy in a public sector. We also understood that kind of one shot, kind of workshops on, you know, here's how you create strategy, have really limited impact in terms of organizational change. So we wanted to commit ourselves to, you know, a five-year process, and more intent repeated work with state agencies to accomplish that.

The third challenge, which is one that I share with them and I think share with anybody in this room, is nobody has any time to plan. And so any kind of structure or tools that we developed had to be able to be applicable in the context of the pressures of doing your day-to-day work.

Now, I'm going to spend a few minutes talking about the model that we've been working with, which has been developed by a gentleman by the name of Mark Moore, no relationship to me. Although the similarities of names have been great because now I'm confused with this wonderful scholar who's done great work. Something I, you know, my mother is greatly proud of.

And it's a strategic model for public value. Now, I'll say a couple of things about this. Public value is different than private value. The marketplace determines private value. If you produce something at less cost than it costs to pay for it, the system works, and the market is great about determining that.



But if you're talking about public value, really market mechanism doesn't work to provide that. There are two kinds of reasons that you produce value in the public sector as opposed to the private sector.

The first is economic failure. You can't produce it; there's a gap in that. And then the second issue is the issue of kind of fairness or justice. And that's the kind of two powerful things of why you do things in the public sector.

Mark actually, and relevant I think to the work that we're doing in the arts, asserts that of those two things, economic failure or an issue of justice or fairness, it's the latter issue that's actually much more powerful in convincing and making the case of public value.

An example I've used in that is, think about the area of women's sports, and the extraordinary kind of flowering of women's sports in the last ten or fifteen years, the enormous high quality and breadth of participation in women's sports. And it wasn't brought about because of an economic strategy to subsidize women's sports, it was an issue of fairness. It just wasn't fair that men and women have different access to sports facilities and opportunity.

And what's curious about that is that you don't have to be a woman, or you don't have to be involved in sports, to really actually accept that as a public value that you'd want to see invested in. And that concept of how do you create a different relationship to the value you're creating and the work that you're trying to achieve, is really behind Mark's model.

AUDIENCE: What's an example of economic failure?

MOORE: Economic failure? Excuse me? I'm sorry. What's an...?

AUDIENCE: Yes.

MOORE: Outside of the arts, a lighthouse, a fire station. The market's not going to create that and you're more likely to buy insurance than you are to like paying for actually having a fire station. But everybody benefits by having it.

AUDIENCE: So something like affordable housing falls into fairness and justice?

MOORE: Yeah. And there are economic pieces of it.

AUDIENCE: Right, but that's where it falls given your analogy, your metaphor, your example. And I was wondering where is affordable

housing in your model. But it goes under fairness and justice?

MOORE: Right, right. Actually issues around sanitation. You know, we want everybody to have clean healthy streets, you know, as opposed to just beautification. So there's a variety of different ways that you talk about a fairness, or justice, issue as doing things in the public sector.

Mark's model is kind of contrary to I think what's existed a lot in the public sector, which is this notion that there's somebody out here that charges you with doing work. You do that work, and then there are ungrateful clients on the other end that complain that you didn't do it well enough.

And the insight that he had was that, that's actually not the way leading public agencies work. Leading public agencies are actually entrepreneurs. And they're having to respond to three different things.

They have to respond to value. They have to do something of value. They have to respond to authorizers. And they have an operating environment. And those three forces are pushing on you inside a public agency and you have to respond to them.

Now let me talk a little bit about that value. You have to create something that's fundamentally of value. And this is where those... in terms of talking about advocacy, we can come back to this, but this isn't primarily about advocacy. You have to do something of value. Because if you're not doing something of value, anybody that's providing you the money and authority to work, to do your work, is making a decision about whether that money is more valuable here, than it is over there.

So the market, if you will, for public value, is determining itself and you can read it in how much money and support that you have. So you have to create something of value, and one of the ways of asking that is to kind of stand outside of your agency and ask, are these resources being better deployed here, than they could be someplace else?

The second pressure is that you have to respond to the authorizing environment. The authorizing environment are the people that give you money, authority, permission to do your work – I'll talk in just a moment kind of some names here – and you have to respond to that pressure as well.

And then thirdly, after you've created a value and after you've got people committed to it, you



actually have to do it. You have to deliver on the value.

And so you can imagine that these three things are not always in balance. You can have something that's highly of value for which there's no authorizing or support for. Conversely you can have something for which there's a really great amount of support and it's actually really of limited value. Or you could have these two things completely aligned and have absolutely no capacity to deliver on those things.

You know, a great way that Shelly talks about doing this is that simple question: is it valuable? Is it supportable? And is it doable? And the dynamic that your agency is under is constantly having to respond to that.

Now Mark's work, interestingly enough, is not in the arts or culture, it's in the area of criminal justice. And Mark has been part of an effort dating back like twenty-five years in the development of community policing, and talk a little bit about the shift of value in policing with the development of community policing.

Prior to really fifteen years ago, ten years ago, the value proposition of policing were three things. Respond to crime after the fact; gather evidence; and support efforts to bring convictions about. And those three things created kind of everything in the dynamic of policing.

It defined what the value was, and how it got measured. It's how you compared whether New York was safer than Seattle on reported crime statistics and response after the fact. It aligned why people were investing in you. We want to invest in you to bring people to account so therefore we can build more prisons.

And it described some of the operating pressures. Height, weight, sex of police officers. Where they were located – at the station house versus in the neighborhood. Radio equipment, 911, all of those things in the operating environment were really designed around those issues.

What happened were beginning pressures inside the world of policing, led by chiefs of police that said there's no amount of kind of additional resources that we can put into this that's going to help us create those values. And some of these things are actually broken. We're noting that reported crime statistics are going down in some places, not because of a reduction in crimes but because people don't report crimes that they don't think anything's going to happen with.

So there were things inside the pressures of policing that really pushed leaders to begin to define changes. And in that field, what happened was a change in how value was described. What if the role of policing was to reduce crime before it happens; improve public safety; and improve justice?

Well if you have those as your goals, suddenly you've got policemen out on the beat. You've got different people that care about that. For every one person that's a victim of crime, there's ten people that want to feel safe to take their kids to the park. It changes who cares about it, and it changes how that value gets delivered or provided.

So that's an example of how, if you're inside the middle of these triangles, you actually have some choices over how you describe what the value is you're creating. And that gives you choice over who's actually going to be committed and engaged in it, and then it has really direct kind of operational implications for how you go about providing that value.

Let me talk just quickly kind of who's who and an approach to how you might kind of begin to map this. It turns out if you're providing value, there's two kinds of groups that you're providing value to: customers and citizens.

I'll talk just a little bit about the distinction between that. Maybe use a library as an example. If I'm teaching my child and I want to use the library and I go in to check books out, I have a value proposition on the library that's really about service to me. And you know, do I get what I need from it? Is it open and clean and safe? And all of the kinds of things that you would care about.

Now, I may not have a child and I may not care about that institution, but I may actually really care about censorship or issues of, kind of access to information or, you know, will kids in the library be exposed to pornography or a variety of different things.

So if you're inside operating an organization and you're trying to create value, you have to create value not only for the customers that you serve, but for the larger community. And some of those values actually can end up in conflict with each other. A really tough issue, you know, think of welfare reform. If you need welfare assistance, you have certain things that you expect from the agency. If you're a taxpayer, you have a number of other things. You know, I want it fair, I want it inexpensive, I want a variety of different things.

If you're on the authorizing environment, you can be a funder, a trustee, you know, a peer.



As peer agencies or peer organizations, there's a legitimacy that you give to each other that's actually a critical part of being authorized to do your work.

And if you're in the operating environment, you have managers, staff, maybe partners, that give you the tools and capacity to try to address those issues.

So one of the things that actually begins to help you think about how you might be able to align this, is literally beginning to map the authorizing environment, or map this triangle.

And so you could think – this is a very crude and simple way to do it – but you could begin to think kind of... Okay, who, you know, customer, citizen, trustee, funder, peer, staff, you know, who is it that you're talking about. And then you could begin to describe, you know, what the value is.

So you may have... If the value that the arts provide are service to at-risk kids, and economic development, or social capital, then you can begin to think that, if I'm a parent... at-risk youth, I may really care about this. Actually if I'm involved in policing I actually may really care about that. If I'm in tourism, I may actually not so much care about that, but really care about economic development.

And then you can, you can imagine how you would begin to sketch that out. And then by understanding that you can actually begin to make some choices about, so which of these values are the ones that I can actually deliver on? Which ones are there the highest kind of authorizing interest in? And how might I begin to kind of make some choices both in how I go about delivering the value, how about connecting support to it, and how I communicate it.

So let me stop there.

AUDIENCE: Michael why aren't... There's other authorizers, why isn't the legislature there?

MOORE: Absolutely. Legislators. There's a long...

TUCKER: It is there.

AUDIENCE: Okay.

Moore: I'm sorry. There's a long list. There's actually a number of other ones in here. The media. The media is a really important authorizer. Courts can actually be an important authorizer in certain kind of public activities, you know, there's really a court pressure that you need to create certain kinds of values.

What we have found helpful about this is not that it proposes – we were talking about silver bullets – not that it proposes silver bullets, but it actually provides a framework that models some of the conflict that I think we're facing in such a way that maybe can begin to allow us to kind of pull those things apart and begin to think about, you know, different strategies, different approaches, different tradeoffs, and what challenges we need to focus on or can focus on.

Any other questions?

TUCKER: We'll have more questions I'm sure. Believe me we'll have more questions.

This is a concept and kind of a conceptual framework that state arts agencies have been working with for a couple years now. And it's been, I think about three years ago that you did the request for proposals basically, from state arts agencies.

MOORE: That's right.

TUCKER: So let me back up a little bit. First of all, as a state arts agency, it's pretty unusual for us to be the grantee; typically we are the grantor. So this is a new relationship for us. When we got the invitation to apply from Wallace Funds, we wrestled with how we would do this. What kind of use would we make of these funds? We didn't have a lot of time to think about it actually because the deadline was pretty short. The application process was pretty short.

Our staff pretty quickly recognized a need that we felt we couldn't achieve with public funding. Almost all of our budget comes from the state legislature and from the National Endowment for the Arts. And we wanted to be able to take some risks to try a different model of outreach to some specific communities, which we then called underserved communities. These are communities that we felt were underserved for reasons of ethnicity, geography, this is Washington State, it's a big state. People with disabilities; and people that were disadvantaged for reasons of economics.

So we had defined those previously for our NEA application as our underserved communities. We wanted to try some different ways of serving those communities, and we felt that would imply some risks that might be precarious with public funds. Public funds require a certain level of accountability.

We wrote a proposal. We were one of thirteen states selected for funding for a multi-year initiative.



Another piece of this that was really exciting to us was that it was also about organizational change. Wallace was also specifying that not only were they going to provide us money, but they were providing us opportunities and a requirement to participate in organizational learning by coming together with Wallace Funds, with to-be-determined leaders in academic and research fields, and with the other state arts agencies to really look at what we were doing, what we had been doing, and what we wanted to be doing with this new initiative.

Our agency was established in 1961 when an Italian governor recognized that the arts are important to what he was trying to accomplish, and the only way that anything could be accomplished of significance in state government was to have an agency. Nineteen sixty-one, so that predates the establishment of the NEA.

Now there are state arts agencies in every one of the states and six kinds of territorial areas like Virgin Islands and Guam. So fifty-six of us. And as we went around the room earlier, I had a name and a face and even a voice in my mind when you said where you are from, because we are a network of state arts agencies. We're kind of like siblings, we fight over funds; we protect each other; we learn from each other. It's a really important network.

This conversation is filtering into that network in some really important ways. Certainly it's filtering into the network of arts organizations in Washington State, and state agencies, because we're able to articulate public value in the arts in some ways that make sense to somebody else.

We're also able to develop some organizational learning practices around this about developing our operating capacity. Note that isn't our organization capacity, that isn't just what we can do, but what can we actually leverage perhaps with grant funding, perhaps by providing technical assistance. Certainly through partnerships, we have new partnerships with state parks, with national parks, with tourism. Lewis and Clark is a big deal in Washington State.

So again, these partnerships certainly affect our operating capacity beyond our organization capacity. They also have to be a fit with the mission and value of our organization, and we hope advance us with our authorizers.

Now the authorizing environment in state arts agencies is changing in huge ways. The state legislature in Washington is facing a significant budget shortfall, not a deficit, we can't have a deficit. But what's on the table is less money and

more need. And I'm sure Lynn's going to talk more about this.

Our governor, who appointed me actually, I work directly for the governor, established a very dramatic change in budget development process last year, which was a results-oriented budget process. The priorities of government. The tenth on a list of ten priorities of government – sometimes it's nine, sometimes it's five, sometimes it's eleven. But one of the priorities of government is to support recreation and cultural opportunities throughout the state.

That's a win for us. We have to be able to deliver on that. We have to be able to speak about results in order to play the game, in order to be at the table. Changing the conversation, perfect timing for this kind of work, for us, and again to have a framework, a vocabulary, and some basic principles that we can articulate but also that we can strategize around, has been hugely helpful.

So I'll end with this, for now, with this little bit for now about organizational change. This money from Wallace isn't going to last forever. We've got two more years with it. The funding has allowed me to hire Mayumi Tsutakawa who's been fabulous in managing this project.

Also we're funding twelve kind of model sites including Langston Hughes, to put this kind of concept to work not just at the state level, but at the local level. Because again, we're committed to trying some different ways of serving these target communities we're now calling them, instead of underserved communities. How can we better work with those?

Now all of our grantees are arts organizations. The focus of all of the projects is the arts. So how can we do that better? Organizational change beyond the money, that has yet to be determined and I'm really excited about what this has allowed us to think about and accomplish.

So, Lynn, you want to talk with us a little bit about how this might make a difference from your perspective?

KESSLER: Yes. Well, first of all, I have spent a lot of time thinking about this and reading about this and trying to find a silver bullet, which I never could find. I thought, how could we just get to the chase here?

As a legislator in Washington State, as Kris said, we changed our whole way of doing the budget. The governor led the way with this sort of priorities of government attitude. And as you know, Kris was successful, as she just said, in



getting cultural as part of one of the priorities of government.

Now if you looked at our budget you'd think somewhere there was a disconnect between what our priorities were and what we were going to do, because the governor actually proposed a forty percent, well, thirty-nine percent cut. That is a pretty dramatic cut for any agency. And of course our agency was ballistic about this and trying to figure out how to get the funding at least not quite as dramatic as thirty-nine percent.

I think that legislators, and I'm sure this is around the country, are asking for accountability and a value for their citizens when they put money into something like the Arts Commission. Because from my perspective – and I've served eleven years in the legislature – the legislators, trust me, most of them don't have a clue about what it is you do, why you do it and what value it has.

You may be able to reach them through an economic model because they do understand money, jobs, they do understand that. But the rest of it is pretty... pretty out of their reach. What we did in Washington state – I don't know if other arts agencies are like this – but we have two members from each chamber, Republican, Democrat, so that we have somebody, a mole, in every caucus that is helping us try to promote and help our membership understand what value the arts provide for our citizens and for our state, not in the short term but in the long term as well.

It's a really difficult battle, and I've thought about it a lot since Kris asked me to come speak today and take part in this conversation. And one of the things that happens in the legislature is that the arts supporters from around come to us when we're in the legislature and ask for support, a little late. It's a little late by that time because... We have Arts Day in Washington State and probably other states do the same thing, and it's fabulous and everybody responds and they're all very cordial and it's lovely. But substantively, it's too late.

The relationships have got to be developed early on, on a one-on-one basis, with not just your legislators, but people in the community who make a difference in your community, who these legislators will listen to, need to articulate the value to these legislators.

And I just want to give you a little example to show how terrible it really is. I dropped a bill this year to create a poet laureate for Washington State. We don't have a poet laureate. You would have thought that I had just introduced a serial

killer into the legislature and asked that he take care of all of our children! It was the most bizarre response I have ever seen. I mean, I was vilified.

AUDIENCE: Why?

KESSLER: Well, because we had serious things. We had a \$2.7 billion budget problem, we had a war in Iraq, we had our soldiers over there dying for us, how dare I come up with a shallow, sort of oblique poet laureate? And I said it's not going to cost you a dime! I mean, this is no dollar... nothing. It will cost you nothing. We were going to do it all through private donations. Kris was very helpful.

Now it seems funny, but it shocked me. It shocked me at the depth and sort of breadth of this sort of lack of understanding about a really simple bill. It wasn't anything that was so scary. I had hate mail, I had... I mean it was amazing! It was amazing.

And I only say this to sort of highlight how people are in the legislature, and I love the people I serve with, but they're a little... not in tune, let me put it that way. And I don't think it's necessarily their fault. I think we, as arts advocates and people in the business need to get a different strategy about how to reach these legislators and how to articulate the value.

And I know we can articulate the value, but how are they really going to see and hear that value? How is that really going to reach their ear so it translates into support? And the four of us who serve on the Arts Commission, we do the best we can, but when there's that... And I don't mean to scare you Kris, but when I realized how really very shallow that was and it really, to me, spoke volumes.

And maybe Washington State is an aberration, I don't know. But I would venture if you went into any of those chambers that are struggling with budgets especially, and there are about forty-six states that are struggling. I heard a couple of you say we didn't get cut. That's wonderful.

But listen, when people are looking for cuts, and I've been on the budget committee for nine years, and when they're looking for cuts, they're dialing for dollars. They don't want to cut social programs like foster care. They don't want to, you know, do something to cut domestic violence programs. They're looking for something they feel people can live without.

Now we all know we can't live without the arts, that the arts is the soul of our culture, it's the soul of our people. It is! But how do we articulate



that that is so incredibly important? And I think Jackie's going to do a really good job of doing that. Because I heard you on the phone one day.

So I bring a challenge. I don't think it's insurmountable, because these are good people. And these are people who are elected by people. And they listen to their constituents. So our challenge is to get the constituents to talk to them in a way that they will understand, listen, and when they get to the legislature, once they're elected, will then be advocates and will not say, well, the arts, we don't need them.

We need the arts in our schools. We need that for our students. It's *incredibly* important for the development of our children and for our future citizens. So how do we get that message to them?

And I've thought about it a lot and the only way to get to them is through children. I mean that's a really good way to get to them is through children. You always have to keep the economics in mind because they listen to that. I just read some American Express study that talked about the \$134 billion that was spent in the arts, you know, in the United States, and how many jobs it created, yada, yada.

That's really good. But don't focus on that. We need to focus on why it's important, and I say we go for the kids. But that's, I'm jumping ahead of the game here but, I think that's one way you can reach your elected officials. Again, develop a real one-on-one relationship. Call them. People, you know, we do respond to individual calls. Ask them to come to your group and talk to them. Have them hear what it is you're doing, why you're doing it and what is the value, and how you're doing a good job. You're operating efficiently and effectively and you are creating something that is good and beneficial for everybody.

I don't really have any answers, but I know the answers are out there with you and with all the people you touch. And that's the other thing I think we need to do is expand our base. We tend to talk to one another. It's very comfortable to talk to one another because we understand the lingo, we understand the goals, we understand where we're going. But it's not enough, people, we all need to just branch out. We need to go out, fan out, when we go out to dinner with our neighbors or relatives or whatever. But get out there! And even hang out there a little farther than where it's very comfortable.

As a legislator I know that I go... I make a point of going to my enemy territory. I do! Because if I can at least get rid of the horns on my head from

their perspective, I've gained something as a politician and in my ability to represent them.

So I don't spend a lot of time... I do some, but I don't spend a lot of time talking to my familiar folks that I know support me. What good does that do? I know they support me. I support them and I see them some, but I really go out and reach beyond my borders, beyond my comfort level and try to get some understanding and communication there. So I really think that's another part of trying to get our message out and going out beyond our comfort zone and where we think things are really happening.

I just went last Saturday to Centralia College here in Washington State, where they had a symposium to discuss an artwork that was commissioned by Washington State by a Washington State artist and then subsequently hung in the Chamber in the House of representatives and subsequently cloaked with drapes and there was a huge court battle over it. It was Michael Spafford's "Twelve Labors of Hercules."

And I am a great supporter of the "Twelve Labors of Hercules," so here my first year, in 1993, one of the votes I had to hear was that they were going to remove these from the chambers. And this was during a downturn in our economy. And it took \$105,000 to remove them from the chamber. They had only paid the artist \$92,000 for the entire group, commission.

And I was outraged. But myself and one other person out of 98 legislators were outraged, that was a pretty small minority. And it's of such value to the state. There was a president of Centralia College, just worked tirelessly to get a building built to accommodate these, and it's a theater for it and it's... our budget.

But in any event, we have a challenge that's not insurmountable. I know that each and every one of us can go out and try to help legislators understand what it is...

MOSCOU: ...about. The difference is we're going to do what we call a roots project which is a capacity building, going into our central district, finding out who's there, what do they know about Langston Hughes? Have they been to Langston Hughes? Would they pay for classes at Langston Hughes? What value do they think of the arts? We're trying to find out public value – you're saying legislatures and how not to cut – we're trying to find out public value from the actual participants themselves.

So while everyone's trying to figure out here, and I am also on this side, the real thing that I want



to do is that the people themselves don't consider. We talked over the telephone about voting. How many people vote? And this is the very fundamental core of democracy?

Well it's the same thing with the arts. We're not just talking about funders. We're talking about people coming to actually see what's going on.

Education is the key. The start... You know you have to have a relationship with something to actually think that it's valuable to you.

And basically... poverty, you know, in this country is broadening. And one of the first things to go in a society that's kind of repressing the poor, basically is the arts. You know, because the arts build critical thinking; the arts build community building; the arts build unity. Arts are the ties that bind us together. The arts build cultural expression. And if those things are being repressed by society at large, then one of the first things to go is that.

In terms of being artists, I've been saying for years, the trouble with artists is they think they're different than anybody else. And like, we're not. What's taking place in the arts community is taking place in the legal community, the education community, the health community. If we look at what's taking place in America at large and we think of...

We can't advocate for one thing and not advocate for all. Just like we can't advocate just for one child and not advocate for them all. We can't have a public school system that actually serves one population and not the other. Well it's kind of the same thing here. I look at it all as a mix. My father had an expression, "Your goals determine your sacrifices."

And as an artist I came to the arts because it was another form of advocacy. I was a child of the '60s born of radical parents, my earliest memories are on picket lines. And my parents brought us to theater not to expose us to the cultural arts but because it was another viable way to expose us to the values that they wanted to teach us.

I saw my role models on stage. I saw integration diversity on stage. I saw advocacy on stage. And in the last, you know, forty years, I've never lost the capacity to see what it is that I want to see or express what I want to see in the arts. It's afforded me everything from my education to my personal pleasures.

And anybody who's exposed to it feels that way. I don't think there's anyone in this room or any child or any adult that hasn't had an experience

that's transforming in some way that has involved the arts.

So why, you know, are we cutting the arts? I think that we have to go to the political at hold and then you're not willing to fight the actual core of the system, you're not going to really have any changes, you know? When we're in a time of authorizing and freedom and expansion like the '60s or like the '30s or like the 1890s, all those times the arts flourished because there was a capacity in our top-down management and in our bottom-up power.

I was just talking to some South Africans. There is a delegation of South African principals here in Seattle now, and we were having dinner and one of them was saying that after apartheid ended officially, 60 percent of their arts just disappeared, because the momentum, the topic, the necessity to express... They hadn't found a way yet, a galvanizing way yet, to express... You know, it took a while for it to catch up. The physicalization of their politics is in flux so their art is in flux also. And also they say arts flourish during oppression. You know, and I'd like to change that! *[Laughter]*

But in general what we're trying to do with the Wallace Foundation is take the same information here, but actually have the participants, and we're forming the community committee, that can look at these facts and actually design them from the perspective of the community.

There's an authenticity that takes place with, if you're targeting a community of color and you're giving them facts, they get to interpret the facts. Because facts are nothing, it's who interprets them. You know, is the glass half full or half empty?

So I've been involved in, you know, basically the professional arts for the last twenty years and I've spent every time there always finding a way for the authorizing community to make sense in the community. If I do an African American play, I want to make sure that African Americans is going to see it, you know? And if this is an all-white theater, you know, and they are used to doing business a certain way, just by my being there I kind of challenge their doing things a different way.

But what's happening now in the new millennium is, artists like myself – and this is happening all over the country – we're saying, this is not working! You know? So we're going back to our communities that have been strip-mined and going back and putting the resources there. So we're going to take this information and



actually give it an opportunity to be looked at differently in the community itself.

I'm going to be talking... you know, I talk to sixth graders now, and amateurs [*Laughs*] and try to find out... And I have the same that you have. I say well... "That ain't got nothing to do... That's not going to bring me no money." And I'm like, oh my God! You know?

You do. You talk about changing their lives, you talk about what is of value, what is not of value, and the first thing you have to do is have them experience it. So in the same way that you're telling people "Talk to your legislators. Have them come to your organization," you know, we're going and saying "Come, come in here. See this."

We'll be doing focus groups, but not focus groups based on information. Our plan is to actually bring people to see the art, and then talk to them about what part of it was valuable, you know what part of it would you come back to again?

And in particular, would you support it? Because in the welfare mentality that's taken place across the boards, across racial, across everything, even though we have the microscope on the people, the have-nots, the haves, it's the same... you know, it's the same thing. They don't want to necessarily support it. They don't mind coming. You know if you bring them in there and give it for free. But they don't necessarily want to support it.

So what is going to make that difference? What's going to make them feel that difference? Participating is going to do a lot of that but also having an opportunity to define the parameters, give people empowerment. And that hope, that justice, the things that you're saying, where people fall off. They fall off because people don't think it's going to make a difference.

And I know that you can express those things. You can see them laid out in black and white through an artistic experience. And it just is more inviting that way.

So this has been a way... The things that have struck me have been, finding a framework, finding a vocabulary. And we need to find a vocabulary and framework that work in both environments, the people that are going to be the customers and the citizens and the people that are going to be the authorizers and the operating people, and how do you bring that together from that constituency?

TUCKER: Great. Thank you. Let's have some broader discussion. Does someone have a question or a comment? Yes. I'm going to pass the mic again to capture your thoughts on tape, but speak up so we can all hear you.

PRATT: Okay. I wanted to respond to something that Lynn said about making the argument about kids, which is an argument that I've used in the past but in the past couple of weeks I've been questioning making the advocacy just about kids because Representative Heather Wilson in New Mexico, just entered this new bill. I think she's introduced it one year before and it hasn't gone anywhere thank goodness. But she introduced a bill in the federal process, and the bill is to take more of the NEA money and put it in arts education, making less for the other things that are funded. So there's that danger.

And I also see a danger in the email chatter about this bill, that we may be setting up our arts education providers in opposition to our arts organizations, because arts education providers are advocating so strongly for Heather Wilson's, you know, we need art and music once a week in the schools, and not really giving credence to the fact that we need the money to go in these other places too, to support the arts. And if we don't have that money there, we're not going to have the arts education happen.

KESSLER: Good comment. There is that tension for sure. I don't think you can do just one strategy, I'm just saying as a part of the strategy, and I'm thinking more in terms of arts as a healer for children. That's a really big one that can grab at people's heart strings, you know. And we know we use art as a healer in a lot of areas with children, in therapy, theater, you know, all kinds of ways.

But that's a really good point, we have to be careful to keep the tension from pitting us one against the other definitely.

MOORE: One of the things that, as I've thought more about the issue of programs for children, that I'm starting to think about and observe, is that that actually may be a classic example of where the issue that's in play is a fairness issue.

And it's curious to me that we're concerned about fairness for children, but we're not concerned about fairness for communities or neighborhoods or adults.

And I actually don't know if this would actually be the difference in your poet laureate... I think



that's actually a really interesting story that you told... But I wonder if it would be the same reaction if it was a poet laureate in every county?

And that there's something about... The focus of our industry over the last thirty years, I think, has really been about supporting the industry's needs. And where you have... Everybody understands the clear value of a highway system. You know, it's pretty straightforward, and why you need to invest in it.

We've developed this infrastructure, and I think largely for adults we haven't made the connection of how that contributes to a vital community. And I think that that's an important connection because it's, you know, it's one thing to say that we're about supporting the arts because we're about supporting the arts. But it's another thing to say, we're about supporting the arts in all those things that it does, because it actually gives communities capacity to do things that they can't do any other way, and then delivering on that.

But I think that that can open up a whole lot of things on it. But it's not without kind of the tensions that you were just describing about it. Because in a lot of ways, our... The way we've constructed this right now has limited the value that we can provide, because of the tensions...

AUDIENCE: So we stretch the definition of arts. As we've been talking in other sessions and over the last several years, that we're... The things that are going on in communities that maybe weren't considered art before and really are art. And as those are raised up maybe that value of adults doing art can be brought more out in front.

MOSCOU: I'd like to address also that... You know I distinguish the difference between art and creativity. You know, creativity is something that all of us, you know, participate in. And art is a very kind of pulled out, specialist part. I mean, anyone can play basketball, some people have the drive to go into the NBA. I mean it takes different things to do them both.

But the argument about the children, and we face that at Langston Hughes a lot, you know, and in some ways people going in that direction because they think that it's fundable and what I always say is it does no good to educate our children if we don't create a society for them to move forward in.

Education that does not get used is not education. And one of the reasons that we're floundering in our school system with African American children, people of color, is because they know it's a lie. They know whatever they study, the

discrepancy that they're going to face, or the double standard that they're going to face.

And we actually have to address that to be true, that they actually know something about their disenfranchisement. And that it's not just stubbornness or we haven't found the right words to reach them but once again going back to the critical point, unless you're really willing to address the real problem, you know, the blood is going to seep through the band aids.

I think it's important basically to say that we fund our public school education. And we should make them do the right thing with that funding. And that arts education is meant to fund the arts. And that if you want to put music in the schools in education, then let the arts agencies or the artists actually go into the schools themselves as real artists and do that, but not to divide the money. You know, that is a divide and conquer.

SOLOTAROFF: I've got a question about fairness. It sounds like that is a value that you talked about as kind of a given, that that would be something that would be convincing to, say, a legislator. But what if it runs up against the need to increase taxes in order to implement fairness? Then what do you say?

I'm thinking of school systems which are based on property taxes so that there's a tremendous amount of inequity in the state because the tax system rewards the affluent communities and it deprives the less affluent communities. How do you argue this when you've got a huge budget deficit?

KESSLER: Well, what state are you from?

SOLOTAROFF: Illinois.

KESSLER: Illinois. In Washington State, our Constitution actually requires that we fund education. So we don't rely on property tax... well, it's part of the funding mechanism but it isn't what we rely on. We must do that, so forty... almost forty-five percent of our budget goes just through K-12 education. And wherever we get that revenue from, whether it's sales tax or the business and occupation tax, property tax, whatever, that is our paramount duty in our Constitution.

So we have a little different way here. But there's no doubt with special levies in our state, which we have to try and augment what we don't give them, that more wealthy communities are more apt to vote for those special levy taxes and get more special ed teachers and get more of everything than the lower economic base.



So I don't exactly...from Washington's perspective we just have a different way of looking at it. There are still inequities, I think Jackie would agree. There are inequities, and for rural communities there's definitely the same kind of inequities that exist.

Well, I don't know, the fairness issue is... I hear it, and I'm trying to figure out how people absorb that. And trying to get taxes out of legislators at this point in time is amazing. We tried to tax gum and candy so that we could fund education and help care for children, and you would have thought that we just were going to drive everybody out of their homes and you're all going to have to give up, you know, living and uh...

Oh it was just amazing! The arguments were just amazing that went on until like three in the morning. I was just like, get a grip! It's candy and gum you people. It's not like you have to... You don't have to have it. And in Washington we don't tax food. Well, I would argue gum is not food. I tell my grandson, "Don't swallow that gum." [Laughter] So, I mean, you know, normally you want them to ingest food.

But anyway it was very interesting.

MOORE: I have a couple of responses to that. Two pieces of it.

One of the things that we've come to grips with in this process is that being a public agency, sometimes success is a twenty percent cut, you know, in terms of the context. And I think being realistic about that and what you do with it is an important piece of it.

The other issue though, is I think that that's where... I go back to, you know, kind of the criminal justice model of kind of the metrics that, you know, policing used to use, kind of number of arrests and a variety of different things.

Well, the metrics that we use largely in determining where we put our charitable investments public or private sector, have to do with artistic quality, you know, financial stability, and we're only now beginning I think to develop tools and facility to talk about access and participation.

But if you, I think, step back and look at how money is actually distributed, it's still largely distributed on the basis of the wealth and age of institutions. It's not based on this kind of other notion of, where can we have the greatest impact in investment in creating vital communities that won't occur any other way.

And so that's actually one of the things that really has made the project... that Washington State been so interesting. Is that they kind of dealt with that very head-on. That there's communities, there's constituencies that are existing processes, built on discipline and peer review of quality and these kind of things that we've inherited, has allowed us to ignore a whole field of really vibrant and important activity.

So that's actually, I think, one way you begin to address equity issues is kind of change of your own standards. And it's a place where you have control.

TUCKER: I would say too that for us, we wanted to change the conversation a little bit. And I think, you know, I certainly see that with legislators. If I come in and I say this is our budget, we need to have it sustained or at the most this percent cut. You could put any label on me. I could be the Parks Department, I could be, you know I could be any children's service agency, I could be anybody, they're all saying the same thing: don't cut me any more than this.

If I talk with them about the arts experience that they have as kids or in their community or something like that, I'm more likely to have a conversation, and I can go further if I can recognize something that they value, something that they value in their community.

We have a fabulous mariachi music program in Wenatchee. It's at a high school, it's received national honors. It's really a fabulous program. And it is a program that is closing the achievement gap, as we call it, in education so that the kids, many of the kids in this mariachi music program are Hispanic, fairly new immigrants, to this rural Washington community. They're involved in this project, they're staying in school, their parents are becoming invested in the community.

That begins a completely different conversation than if I go in and say, give me money. I guess the point of this is to say, we have to figure out how to have different conversations because the legislators or others in our authorizing environment are going to use the conversations that they're comfortable with. If we don't give them new language to talk about this stuff, then they're not going to talk about it in new terms.

So enough of my soapbox. Rem, you were next I think, and then Patrice.

CABRERA: I wanted to share our experience within the colorful state of Florida over the course of the last year. I'll try not to take up the



remaining time telling you all everything I'm going to share with you.

We went through some critical changes in our state in the last couple of years. Our secretary of state, who used to be, or supposedly is still, responsible for cultural policies and issues in the state of Florida, was formerly an elected position. And we changed it to an appointed position by the governor. And need I remind you that our governor's last name is Bush.

Likewise we also created term limits for our legislators in Tallahassee. Which means particularly for Miami Dade County, we have a lot of very young, late twenties, early thirties people suddenly getting a lot of power, moving into Tallahassee, and making destructive decisions on things they largely know nothing about.

And this past summer for the first time ever we saw our state budget cut from \$28 million to 6.2. And as I pointed out yesterday in the afternoon workshop, the entire state of Florida is currently getting less money than Miami Dade County got last year. So obviously the issue of advocacy is something we're facing.

A couple months ago our Division of Cultural Affairs at Tallahassee initiated a series of statewide meetings to discuss with its constituents, not just culture but also libraries and historic preservation, this idea of merging the Office of Arts and Culture with Historic Preservation. And these meetings were met with great hostility around the state, partly because of the fact that the idea of the merger would be presented as a *fait accompli* even though we were told that we were being asked to come in and discuss this idea.

Also because of the big recent cuts and this knowledge concept of the merger, the arts people were frankly afraid that what the governor was essentially trying to do was slowly dismantle any responsibility on behalf of the state of Florida towards arts funding.

We are beginning to see a turnaround. There has been enough outrage voiced that the Governor has backed off and the Secretary of State has backed off and hopefully at least the merger idea has been put on hold for the time being.

But what we started to do locally is recognize what you said earlier, was the need to have direct contact with our legislators. And our chairman of the board, who is a very dynamic corporate CEO who is capable of literally cornering the Governor into a corner and pointing a finger into his face, has insisted that this trend cannot continue.

And she has gathered about fifteen civic leaders in Miami, along with some of the top, powerful legislators including the House Majority – who unfortunately is not as supportive of the arts as you are – and they're starting to make some headway. At least for now we're beginning to see a glimmer of hope for next year.

But that issue of having to advocate and create these connections between the arts organizations and the elected officials is absolutely critical.

I should say, as a personal experience, I met with one of our legislators who told me when I met with him in his office that I was the first person in the history of his term in office who would come from an arts organization to talk about arts funding.

And afterwards I found out he was blatantly lying to me. *[Laughter]* That the Miami Children's Museum, and the Jewish Museum and many others have been in his office many times over the years to talk about funding for the arts. And even though I gave him reams and reams of paper to explain to him about accountability and grant applications and process panels, final reports and so on, he refused to look at any of it and understand that there is accountability already built into our process.

I'll close by saying I had an argument with the Undersecretary of Community Development at one of our state meetings about the merger, who insisted on the old argument of, in times of economic crises, how can the arts look at us, we go on making decisions about the state budget and say that they are as deserving of funding as medical services, social services and so on?

And what I got back to her with was, why does it always have to be a battle between the arts and medical services? Why can't it be between the arts and more trees for our highways? Why can't it be arts against something else? Why must you always draw that parallel?

It's quite a challenge that we have in Florida and we're not giving up, but to do what's going on in Washington is really... I invite you to move to Florida. *[Laughter]*

AUDIENCE: Thank you. I have two quick points that I'd like to hopefully get some response to, or if not just offer, is ideas on the value of the arts. One, because I think we're about validating the arts. Certainly there are as many arguments to validate the arts as there are artists probably. But I want to talk about two in particular.



One is unfortunately for me a throwaway argument because it's one that I find that we can't make with any real sense of communication, integrity, and that is the transformation, the restorative and the almost spiritual value of the arts. That's not one that, that's not an argument that's easy to make. That's one that's very personal.

But I still think that there are legitimate notes to make in terms of... especially in today's culture with so many cultural dilemmas, I look at the possible civic engagement. I have a teenage daughter, I look at the many seductive images that are in front of her that I consider to be really negative, and they're cultural images. But I think that still we have to look at arts in terms of contributing to our spiritual and our character values.

But the platform that I want to ask you to consider, particularly for you as a legislator, is one of the value in the *civitas*. I think that the realm of design is very underrated in the arts in general, it's one of our smaller arts fields, particularly because the nonprofit industry is very confused with the profit industry. But nevertheless I want to talk about the arts in terms of the design element and the character of the city, or the character of place, I don't think it needs to be city.

But in the character of place there's a sense of, not only individuals and communities needing to celebrate and validate themselves, but having pavilions and memorials and edifices which inspire.

We have a new design director at the agency, his name is Jeff Svitt. He comes from Miami and he is a town planner. And I think that beginning to include, particularly mayors, in these conversations, the endowment has a sponsored Mayor's Institute for the Arts where we invite in mayors from across the country for kind of a clinic to learn about design and any design challenges they may have, including a bridge that needs to be reinvented for pedestrian use, or a blighted abandoned warehouse that needs to be reinterpreted as part of work front development. There's so many challenges.

But I think I come to Seattle, this is probably my third visit, I come with a sense of excitement about the city and about the place. And I'm excited as I walk around just to see what my eyes can digest. And even if you were in a rural community, there's a certain sense of integrity about place and about the design of that place, whether it's natural design or material design.

And I would urge you to, particularly in your building arguments here, to look at the character of community both in a material way, as well as in a more transparent way. And think about the design elements and how you might be able to use that as a constructive element in all of our work.

TUCKER: Thank you. A response to either of these two comments?

KESSLER: I'm just very intrigued and that's a wonderful suggestion.

MOORE: One quick response that I will make is that we are completing and will publish in early spring 2004, summer 2004, a study that we're doing on the benefits of the arts that looks at both the utilitarian benefits – tourism, economic development, all of those kinds of things – and the intrinsic benefits. And the RAND Corporation is doing that study for us.

And one of the things that we're most excited about is that they've really shed some great insight on the relationship between the intrinsic values of the arts, the transformative process that artists provide by being these people that can perceive things and make them tangible through a creative act, that that's actually the core of every other benefit, for kids, for economic development.

And that's good news, because they're co-produced, they're the same thing, they're not at war. And it's a way to push that forward. So I think we're going to be in a better position to make some of those connections. And having somebody like RAND making that point helps.

TUCKER: We have one more and I'll just give it to Patricia. But I don't think we need to... We have to be somewhere at noon right? So some of you, if you want to stick around, that's fine with me.

AUDIENCE: I just wanted to say thank you for that point, Michael. Because when we use language that avoids and does not hit directly on the point of intrinsic value in the arts, I think what happens is we always find ourselves in the position of subverting our own argument.

I just had the good fortune of taking two trips this year, one to France, to look at comparative ways of funding the arts, both the public sector and the private sector, and then to Cuba. One very wealthy, European society, I mean, you know, when you look at it in total, and then the other an economically deprived place.

In both of those places, arts had such an intrinsic value that there was no way that you would go into a legislature there, and in fact we



encountered the city officials, the legislators, who felt it an outrage that one would expect private citizens to have to give to the arts when in fact it was their duty to support the arts.

But on the other hand I could go to Cuba and see the same thing, so that there was no sense of, we have to educate doctors and/or artists, but you do both. And that that was seen...

And it goes to your point, Jackie, of how do you look at the whole? What do we come together in a society to accomplish? And what are our goals in that? And how are we linking our health care with our education, with our arts activities, because in fact there is something that is very healing that probably lessens the degree of stress, and all of the other anxiety-related diseases that we encounter in this society, which takes a fortune to attend to by all kinds of medication that we are completely confronted with on every occasion, and the rising cost of healthcare.

And the fact that we have got to somehow look at language that allows us within these kind of structures, which I think are very helpful in terms of making concrete our thinking, to look at what are those values, the intrinsic values, and then linking it to the other societal ills, if you will, or the good things that happen in our society and why we come together, and how we can benefit the culture.

Because for me it's never a matter of whether we're going to do healthcare or we're going to do education or we're going to do the arts. We have an obligation to do all three. And if we're going to sacrifice anything, I would say that we should sacrifice... oh, the war effort or... [Laughter] Because there's never a shortage when it comes to that! And if we as citizens cannot address that...

TUCKER: Thank you. Thank you.

ABRAMS: I just want to add... I wanted to add a footnote to what you've been saying which I think is kind of a sad but funny commentary on the way we live. Montgomery County is the home of the snipers. And as you may know, this happened about a year ago, we had a sudden upsurge in people understanding the transformative value of the arts after the sniper.

Because children were being encouraged to express themselves through the visual arts and through performance, and people were being encouraged to go to concerts. And it was just an amazing sort of, "Oh my God, they got it!" kind of sense in the arts community. And then of course as soon as all of this danger and everything went away, this sense went away.

But we try to recapture that whenever we can without feeling that we have to threaten people with snipers to do it. It was just a very interesting occurrence that we all kind of looked around and thought, is this really happening? And it was! People were really understanding about the transformative in the arts.

AUDIENCE: Snipers for the arts. [Laughter]

AUDIENCE: I mostly want to thank you because you've really sparked something that I can't quite articulate yet. And I've got a minute to give a real quick shot at it.

The whole notion of needing to change the argument and the articulation to our political leaders... That's something that I think we've all known for quite a while.

But Jackie, you said something that really... made something... you know, something connect about the fact that supporting the arts is about supporting individual expression, the development of communities, being a citizen, and living in a democracy.

And when our leaders are trying to stifle that individual expression and the empowerment of individuals and communities, that's something to me that, when I look at the Democratic senate leader in the state, who's an incredible liberal on terms of social issues, but was largely responsible for the decimation of the California Arts Council, I think that kind of argument about empowering people...

Something's going on there that I'm very intrigued and want to continue to think about, because this is very exciting to me.

TUCKER: There's a piece of this we haven't talked about which is worth another several hours, about arts participation, and the work also that RAND has lead about understanding arts participation, is really relevant to civic engagement. The concept is about deepening, broadening and diversifying arts participation, which is different than audience development. And it is a complete overlay with civic engagement.

When we were in Seattle for a meeting a few months ago I learned that the median age of Seattle residents is mid-thirties. The median age of the Seattle voter is the mid-60s. Does this not sound like the discussions we've had about audience development?

So again, are there things that we are learning about audience development that we might apply to civic engagement?



MOORE: Just two seconds on that. The study that we did that's available on our Web site called "Reggae to Rachmaninoff" points at a number of things.

People that participate in the arts are twenty percent more likely to be registered to vote. They're about twenty percent more likely to volunteer in their communities. They're about twenty percent more likely to belong to other civic organizations. They are two and a half times more likely to be church attenders. There's a variety of things that you don't... When you represent that to authorizing environment, suddenly it changes from, you're not talking your industry, you're talking about their neighbors. And that's a different conversation.

AUDIENCE: And I'd like to say in terms of that and how we leave it, that again these incredible informative facts and frameworks and stuff like that, that the job here also, which has been devoid in the last thirty years is to take that education and that to the people themselves. That when you go to a community that's ridden with crime, and thinks that it's not important for their child to take a piano lesson or that to come see this play isn't important, that when you say that, if your child is exposed to this in your community, that twenty percent will volunteer for another organization, or twenty percent will register to vote, well that brings so much to just the community itself, and not just the authorizers. So the same language has to be translated to both.

MOORE: That's right.

KESSLER: May I just say one thing about who presents the message, too. And I think when Rem said he went in and talked to this majority leader and was treated so poorly as to be lied to...

Kris does a fabulous job with the legislators, but there's another element that needs to come and talk to legislators, and hopefully outside the capital, hopefully in their districts. And that is people like Jackie, people who actually get great benefit from that. Children, I mean when children talk to legislators they just puddle up. I mean the old, you know, we'll give them just about anything.

So I think who's delivering the message and where they deliver it is very important because whenever we advocate... Well, I'm on the Arts Commission so obviously I'm representing the organization, so when I advocate, well they anticipate I would, because I support it.

What they need is to hear people who are not part of the organizations coming to them and

saying, I'm a citizen, I'm a voter, and I support this and this is why. And this is what it does for our community. It's that representative's community too. They live in those communities and they want...

So I think they... We need a dual track, both the art advocates who are in the institutions, but we also need the people who are there benefiting and can articulate why it's a benefit.

TUCKER: I think it's really great to have a session when you end on such an energetic note. We are ten minutes late. I think most of us could stay a few more minutes, but thank you, keep thinking, and keep in touch.

END

